The Canonisation Of Emma Humphreys

infotextmanuscripts.org/wikinut/wikinut-the-canonisation-of-emma-humphreys.html

wikinut

Prostitute and murderess Emma Humphreys

That is what we are asked, nay told, to believe today, and indeed this is the lie a small group of dishonest, delusional feminists have foisted on Britain and the world. Before going any further, it should be stated that the case of Emma Humphreys was a tragic one, no reasonable person would dispute that, but even though she was only seventeen when she murdered Trevor Armitage, there remains the question of agency. So what led up to this crime, and how is it that today, nearly nineteen years after her premature death, Emma Humphreys is remembered by third wave feminism not as a cold-blooded murderess but as an heroic figure?

The facts of her case as documented by the press, the courts, and Humphreys herself, are not controversial, but new *facts* have been added since she appealed to the sisterhood for help, and an entirely new narrative of her life has been crafted especially

since she died from an overdose in her North London apartment on July 11, 1998. So let us begin at the beginning. Emma Humphreys was born at Dolgellau, Wales on October 30, 1967. (Her middle name is often misspelt Claire, and sometimes her surname is given as Humphries, but the official microfiche gives her birth name as Emma Clare Humphreys). Her mother's maiden name was Ackroyd.

Unless stated otherwise, the following information was gleaned from the *The Map Of My Life: The Story Of Emma Humphreys*.

The date of the murder is usually given as February 26, 1985. However, it was committed very late in the day so may have been either February 25 or the small hours of February 26. This is not important. It was reported extremely briefly on the front page of the local press, the *EVENING POST* (Nottingham), No. 33,131, for February 27, 1985. Under the title *Girl, 17, on murder charge*, the article reads verbatim:

EMMA Clair Humphries, 17, of Turnberry Road, Bulwell, was today remanded in prison custody until March 6 by Nottingham Guildhall magistrates, charged with the murder of 33-year-old salesman Trevor Armitage.

Emma Humphreys stood trial later in the year. By that time, she was eighteen years old; it was a short trial, Humphreys herself did not testify although there were defence witnesses. She was convicted on December 4 and ordered to be detained during Her Majesty's Pleasure.

She appears to have been resigned to serving a life sentence, and being paroled on licence at some point. However, on September 24, 1992, she wrote to Julie Bindel of the misnamed Justice For Women organisation. She appears to have heard of them through the press, in particular the case of Kiranjit Ahluwalia, which was currently before the courts. (This organisation is the brainchild of airhead feminist Bindel and her lesbian lover Harriet Wistrich, the latter of whom tried unsuccessfully to have Alexander Economou thrown into gaol for having the temerity to protest his innocence when falsely accused of rape by a woman who was nearly as demented as Humphreys).

Coincidentally, like Humphreys, Ahluwalia had lived in Canada, and had in fact married there. One night in May 1989 while her husband was asleep, she poured two pints of petrol into a bucket, threw it over him, then set him on fire. Assisted by neighbours he was taken to hospital, but died six days later. Ahluwalia was convicted of murder, but in July 1992, the Court Of Appeal quashed her conviction and ordered a retrial. The day after Humphreys' letter, Ahluwalia pleaded guilty to manslaughter and walked free time served. The merits or otherwise of that case will not be discussed here, it will suffice to say that it differed significantly from this one. While there is no doubt that Ahluwalia suffered at the hands of her husband for years, her calculated act does not have even the pretext of spontaneity which is usually required for a successful defence of provocation. By the same token, there is no credible evidence that Humphreys was ever seriously assaulted by much less raped by her victim, as we shall see in due course.

After her initial letter, Justice For Women swung quickly into action, and her case went to the Court Of Appeal in June 1995; the following month a manslaughter conviction was substituted for her murder conviction. Like Ahluwalia three years previously, she walked free time served, although unlike Ahluwalia there was no retrial. As she left the Royal Courts of Justice she was surrounded by cheering crowds of *wimmin*, and treated like a genuine heroine, yet it wasn't to last. Three years later she was dead, and by that time although they will never admit it, even Julie Bindel and Harriet Wistrich had grown tired of her.

In 2003, they published *The Map Of My Life...*which includes poetry and writings by Humphreys herself. Along with Hannana Siddiqui, Bindel and Wistrich also wrote *Emma Humphreys Remembered* which was published in *Trouble & Strife The radical feminist magazine*, No. 38, pages 69-72.

Our final sources along with the Court Of Appeal judgment and contemporaneous press reports of the murder are the dedicated Emma Humphreys website and the misleadingly titled Justice For Women website along with the equally misleadingly titled short film *Emma Humphreys the legacy* which was uploaded to YouTube on November 12, 2009 by the film-maker Pratibha Parmar.

Let us begin with the Emma Humphreys website – archived versions are used here. According to its History Page:

"As a child, Emma witnessed many violent assaults on her mother by her stepfather; both were alcoholics. As a result of her brutal home environment, she ran away many times and spent periods in care and on the road."

It continues in the same vein, thus we are told that because of this violence, Emma ran away from home, began using drugs and drinking alcohol; she was exploited by both pornographers and as a prostitute, she moved in with Trevor Armitage because she was homeless and because she thought he loved her, but he kept her on a tight lease virtually holding her prisoner in his house, subjected her to extremes of emotional, physical and sexual abuse (rape), until finally she stabbed him in the heart fearing he would rape her yet again, or even use the murder weapon on her.

None of this came out at her trial because:

"On arrest Emma's state of shock was such that she was unable to explain why she had killed Armitage or describe the history of violence and abuse. Because of her extreme traumatisation, Emma allowed the police to construct her statement and could not give any evidence in her defence. Emma was convicted of murder and was sentenced at 17 years old to prison with an 'indefinite sentence'."

That is quite a victim narrative, but one that is easy to deconstruct because it is so

frivolous. Let us begin at the beginning though. Emma Humphreys was the second of three daughters born to the former Pamela Ackroyd and her first husband – who gave her her surname. The marriage broke up when the girls were young, and Mrs Humphreys moved back to her native Nottingham taking the girls with her. She must have been an attractive woman because she soon met a man who was prepared to take on not only her but her three daughters. All four relocated to Alberta with Al Somerville, who as an oil rig worker was clearly earning decent money and could provide for his new family.

*The Map Of My Life...*contains the same allegations, but from what little information is available, the claim that Al Somerville was grossly physically abusive is an over-simplification. Her mother was or had become a lush, and he was certainly violent towards her though not to Emma. Also, neither of Emma's sisters mimicked her behaviour, which strongly suggests that whatever problems she had were purely or largely psychological in nature. Perhaps she simply didn't like her new home or her stepfather, at any rate, this did not improve, though obviously in keeping with feminist victim narratives, her grossly delinquent behaviour can only have been his fault, or the fault of some man/men.

From the age of 12, Emma Humphreys is said to have begun hitchhiking lifts from men who would sexually abuse her, which is how she was drawn into prostitution and pornography, and becoming increasingly suicidal. A 12 year old girl who hitchhikes is asking for trouble, running the risk of far worse than rape, but in spite of what Bindel and Wistrich think, most male drivers would either not stop for a child of that age, or would hand her over to the authorities. No independent evidence is provided of her becoming involved in prostitution in Canada, which would be statutory rape at best, and as for child pornography, if she had really been involved in that, evidence would have come to light, even if the actual photographs/films were not released (for the obvious reason). Having said that, she does indeed appear to have engaged in prostitution, even though attempts were made by the authorities to stop her, hence her time in care.

When she was in her early teens, her father got in touch with her and asked if she would like to come and live with him. She agreed, and returned to Nottingham, where he was now living too. He has also remarried, and for whatever reason, shortly after her return, Emma decided she didn't want to live with him and his new wife, so she moved in with her maternal grandmother and great aunt. When that didn't work out, it was decided she should return to Canada. This begs the question, would she really have wanted to do so if her stepfather had been so physically abusive to her mother and especially to her?

In her film, Pratibha Parmar asks Humphreys if she was sexually abused when she was little. Humphreys said she didn't know, and couldn't remember the time she spent with her father. Who is being accused of child sexual abuse here: father, stepfather or both? More to the point, has Parmar read *The Courage To Heal*? Somebody was abusing her though: herself. She claimed she had been cutting herself from the age of seven, something no normal child of that age does.

She was then put on a plane back to Canada, but the Canadians didn't want her, which begs the question why not? Although she was refused admission she was allowed to stay overnight with a foster mother. Predictably, she did a bunk, and remained at large for several weeks before she was rounded up and put on a plane back to England. We are not told how she survived until then, but one can hazard a guess: prostitution and/or illegal activity. As she was still a minor, she was not only at risk herself but was a risk to any man with whom she came into contact. Really she ought to have been locked up for her own protection; her history of self-harming would have been ample pretext for that. This did not happen though, and when she arrived back in England she ended up selling her body on the streets of Nottingham.
As was pointed out in the Court Of Appeal judgment, one cannot judge a seventeen year old by the accepted reasonable person standard – what used to be called the man on the Clapham omnibus – nor any younger teenager, but Emma Humphreys had up to this point in her life made a series of bad choices. She could have stayed with her mother or her father or her grandmother; she had been in care more than once, and that was still an option. Even after being kicked out of Canada she had reasonable choices; instead she chose prostitution.

In a press report on her trial (December 3), her father is said to have heard in 1983 that she had been involved in prostitution, had been drinking, and taking drugs. It is not known how accurate this information was, but whether or not she had sold her body before, this was how she met Trevor Armitage. He was twice her age, and, to put it mildly, no angel. According to the local press at the time of her trial, he was known to the vice squad, and had had something of a wayward youth. As a teenager he was tried for attempted murder but found guilty of a lesser offence and sentenced to borstal. He had a conviction for threatening behaviour and for possessing an offensive weapon back in 1973. His most recent conviction appears to have been for a common assault on a prostitute in 1977.

On the plus side he was said to have had a seven year association with a psychiatric nurse called Elizabeth Bailey. The nature of that association is unclear, but she said that although he had once threatened her (ie with violence), he had never actually hit her. Armitage also had a son who was a bit younger than Humphreys.

The oft' repeated claims that Humphreys was raped repeatedly by Armitage, that he locked her in the house, and that she was regularly physically assaulted, have no basis in fact. In her diary she claims he gave her a black eye, this may be true, but it remains to be seen if this was what could be called an abusive relationship or if the violence was reciprocal. She did not report him to the police, she did not even leave him. What does that say? In her diary she also alludes to having fights with Armitage, the context is not clear, but a fight is a two-way street.

Two days before the murder she told a woman called Nicola Whitehead that she didn't like working as a prostitute, and that if she did not supply Armitage with drink, he would become angry, but there was no mention of violence, sexual or otherwise. Also, on

February 23, her mother phoned the police from Canada telling them she had received a call from her daughter who told her she was afraid of Armitage. Police attended the house but no one appeared to be home, and they were not able to gain access.

The Canonisation Of Emma Humphreys – 2

Julie Bindel

However, and this is most important, it was not Armitage who was the perpetrator here, but Humphreys. She picked up one client who simply wanted to talk – something that is apparently not uncommon for prostitutes – my wife doesn't understand me, and all that. According to Humphreys:

"His idea was that I should stay the night in the hotel, then go down the social in the morning, quit prostitution, get a house and a proper job".

Her response was:

"God, that didn't appeal to me. I didn't feel strong enough even to consider going on with

life alone without someone looking out for me".

So it is clear that not every man she met treated her like rubbish, indeed even Armitage wasn't a total scumbag, because another of her clients turned up at the house apparently thinking he was rescuing a damsel in distress, which he clearly was not. He told her to leave him and set up on her own. He was not exactly a white knight, but his appearance led to a bit of a barny, and Armitage called the police. By this time he'd had enough of her because:

"The police told me that Trevor wanted me out and so I made an agreement with them that I would sit and finish my drink then I would pack up and go".

Armitage decided to leave and drive around until they were gone. Then she trashed the house including pouring a bottle of bleach over the bed and a couple of his suits, and started smashing the windows. The taxi arrived, but so did the police again; a neighbour had complained, Armitage returned, and along with her would-be rescuer, Humphreys was arrested.

It should be noted that at no point did Humphreys tell either this other character or the police that she had been assaulted by much less raped by Armitage. Normally when someone is in a tight spot like this – woman, man or child – allegations fly, false or otherwise, but not here. From this we can conclude that however distasteful Harriet Wistrich, Julie Bindel or anyone else may find this relationship, it was consensual, including the sex. So Emma Humphreys was not raped by Trevor Armitage, period.

In her first letter to Bindel, Humphreys said at the time she killed Armitage she was on bail for a number of charges of soliciting, loitering, and two assaults that took place on Christmas Day at a hotel: the manager and a police officer – very unwise. And then there was the criminal damage on the house. She was sent to a bail hostel, but after she broke her bail conditions she was remanded in custody. What happened next is further proof as if any were needed that Armitage was not the monster Julie Bindel and company would have us believe, because he had a change of heart, and when she appeared in court on February 21, she was given a 2 year conditional discharge and released *into the care* of Trevor Armitage. This is Humphreys in her own words.

On the night of the murder, she, Armitage and his son Stephen had been to a bar, drinking. They went back to the house, and Armitage drove Stephen home before returning. He was said earlier in the evening to have told Humphreys:

"We'll be all right for a gang bang tonight".

We are not told in what context this was said, ie was it a bad joke, an in-joke...? Indeed, we have only the word of Humphreys that he actually said it. After he returned home, he sat next to her on the landing wearing only a shirt. She was cutting her wrist with a knife, and he is meant to have joked that she wasn't making a good job of it. He lay down on his

back, and she stabbed him through the heart.

Because she didn't testify at her trial, none of this evidence was heard, and indeed it would have done her no good if it had been. She appealed her conviction the following year, but that appeal was quickly abandoned. Now listen again to the claims made by the Emma Humphreys website. Simple arithmetic disposes of the claim that by the time she contacted Justice For Women, Humphreys had spent over ten years in prison, and the claim on the About Page that the aim of the annual Emma Humphreys Prize is:

"to provide recognition for work against violence and to bring it to the attention of a wider public."

is too stupid to comment on, but here again is what the History Page says about her arrest and trial:

"On arrest Emma's state of shock was such that she was unable to explain why she had killed Armitage or describe the history of violence and abuse. Because of her extreme traumatisation, Emma allowed the police to construct her statement and could not give any evidence in her defence. Emma was convicted of murder and was sentenced at 17 years old to prison with an 'indefinite sentence'."

She stabs a man through the heart, a man who has a son slightly younger than her, and nine months later *she* is still traumatised? No, that is not the case at all. If she had testified and claimed he had raped her, abused her so badly that she was driven to kill him, what would have followed? Cross-examination, that's what. That might have gone something like this:

Are you saying Trevor Armitage was a violent man, Miss Humphreys?
I suggest that if he was violent, so were you, you were charged with two assaults on Christmas Day last year, were you not?
You were arrested for breaking his windows and destroying his clothes, were you not?
And after you were sentenced he took you back, did he not?
You could have gone to live with your family, or asked the council to house you as a vulnerable teenager, but instead you went back to him, this man who repeatedly assaulted and raped you. Are we supposed to believe that?

According to the feminist mantra, yes, we are to believe any woman, whatever she tells us. If she claims to have been raped last year, five years ago, a decade and more ago, walks into a police station and makes that allegation, the police and everyone else are supposed to believe her *uncritically*, even if she has continued her relationship with her alleged rapist, a man who has no power or influence over her. Believe women, if you don't, you can only be a misogynist, a rape apologist, or even a rape enabler. How absurd is that? It is not only absurd but frightening, because with regard to historical allegations, that is exactly the position our courts take.

So Emma Hunphreys did not testify at her murder trial, but if she had, there is one more question that could have been put to her in cross-examination: why did she phone her mother telling her she was afraid of Armitage, a call that was apparently of such urgency that her mother phoned the British police from Canada to alert them of this apparent danger? There was no danger, because Humphreys went out drinking with Armitage and his son the night of the murder, but the big question is, was she planning to kill him, and was this phone call intended to plant the seed of doubt in the minds of the police that she really was in mortal danger, and that her killing him would have been justified?

That is really not such a fanciful hypothesis, but even without it, Humphreys was guilty as sin. So how did Justice For Women succeed in having her case referred back to the Court Of Appeal? How indeed?

Thanks primarily to Jack Straw, the Criminal Cases Review Commission was set up in 1997 after the passing of the requisite legislation. Before that, referrals back to the Court Of Appeal were done via the Home Secretary under the *Criminal Appeal Act*, 1968. Then as now, the Court Of Appeal will not hear evidence unless it is genuinely fresh evidence, or if it is not fresh then there is a good reason it was not presented at trial. It must also be evidence that is *worthy of belief*. Given enough time and resources it is possible to manufacture evidence of guilt – which is one reason many countries but not the UK have sensibly enacted statutes of limitations; and also to manufacture evidence of innocence, including alibi evidence. In fact, although she did not testify at the appeal – as usual – Humphreys *was* permitted to manufacture fresh evidence which was submitted on her behalf and accepted uncritically by the Court without being tested by cross-examination.

Her actual grounds for appeal were:

that the judge had erred (i) in not directing the jury that they could take the seriously abnormal personality of the appellant into account as a characteristic to be attributed to the reasonable person when considering whether that person would have lost her self-control and behaved as the appellant did; and (ii) in restricting the jury's attention to events immediately surrounding the killing.

Exactly how an abnormal personality is to be taken into account by a jury in a murder trial remains to be seen unless we are to believe that being abnormal is a get out of jail free card. And, in accepting the second ground, the Court allowed in the following so-called evidence:

that Armitage regularly beat her up
that he threatened to rape her – the comment about a gang bang

Again, whatever his criminal past, the evidence that Armitage beat her is weak, certainly he never inflicted life threatening or serious injuries on her, and there is no evidence at all that he raped her. Indeed, after she trashed his home he forgave her and took her back. Let us be clear about this, whatever violence there was in this relationship was either

relatively trivial or reciprocal. The rape claims simply do not stack up; why would a woman live voluntarily with a man who rapes her? Humphreys could have walked out on Armitage at any time, but she went back to him when she had at least three viable alternatives: living with her father, living with her grandmother, or seeking housing from social services, something that would surely have been offered to her as a vulnerable teenager. Her returning to Armitage implies consent, including consenting to having sex with him. Consensual sex may be sordid but it is *not* rape. By definition.

The appeal judgment is based on neither law nor fact, but on emotion. One can only assume the Lords Justices felt sorry for her, but that is no basis for quashing a murder conviction. It is even more remarkable when one considers her behaviour since her conviction.

In February 1989, she was transferred to HMP Styal where she made allegations of sexual harassment against a male member of staff; this resulted in her transfer to New Hall, another closed prison. This indicates that her allegation was not believed, but as the feminist definition of sexual harassment can include saying good morning to a woman, we'll let that one pass.

In September the same year, the Parole Board recommended her transfer to an open prison but this was (wisely) blocked higher up.

In November 1992, she was accused of threatening another inmate with a knife, but nothing came of this. In view of what she was convicted of, an allegation of this nature would have been taken extremely seriously by the prison authorities.

It is evident that in view of her age and in spite of her obvious mental condition, she was already being groomed for release on life licence, and in May 1993 she was allowed home leave – an incredibly short time after a murder conviction, *But*, she failed to return, having been discovered unconscious after taking an overdose of antidepressants.

This one act suggests that she was not ready to be released. Had she served another ten or even another five years and then been released on licence, there might have been some hope for her. Instead, the Lords Justices bowed to the whims of the sisterhood, and Emma Clare Humphreys left the Royal Courts of Justice to the cheers of militant feminists. Anyone would have thought she'd broken a world record on the sports field rather than stabbed a defenceless man through the heart, a man who had accepted her back into his home after she had broken its windows and ruined his suits.

Alas, although the euphoria lingers on, *her* joy was short lived. According to the back page of *The Map Of My Life...*:

"These powerful writings document the life of an abused teenager in care, who became exploited into prostitution and beaten by her pimp/'boyfriend' to the point where she was driven to kill him".

Those sentiments are echoed in the *Foreword* by the feminist QC Vera Baird, who makes it clear that the only people to be blamed are the men in her life, not Humphreys herself. But whoever was to blame, her two biggest champions would themselves eventually grow tired of Humphreys. And so would everybody else.

The Canonisation Of Emma Humphreys – 3

Harriet Wistrich

She received a lot of help from her loony feminist friends but:

“Within five days of her release, Emma was in the Whittington hospital having overdosed on chloral hydrate. During the first eighteen months of her freedom, Emma ran wild. She drank and took all manner of drugs to excess; she continued to self-harm by cutting up, through serious anorexia and by getting into dangerous situations with the sort of men who prey on vulnerable women. She was thrown out of the therapeutic community she was living in, having broken every rule; she was likewise thrown out of a mental health hostel and a number of other forms of accommodation found for her”.

Then:

“Things began to change after she was seriously assaulted by a stranger...she started to reduce the risks she had been taking with men”.

Again, it is men who are to blame, not Humphreys herself. Finally, as Wistrich writes at page 219:

“Emma constantly tested our tolerance to the limit, certain that eventually she would prove that she didn’t deserve our love. She came quite close to succeeding one night, when we had to make the painful decision to turn her away from our house at 5am with nowhere to go”.

In other words, even Saint Julie and Mother Harriet gave up on her, but incredibly Bindel concludes:

“Emma was indeed very special. She helped me realise the true and total cost of male violence, in a way I had not fully grasped in eighteen years of feminism”.

Further proof as if any were needed that these women are not simply dishonest but delusional.

The prison diaries of Emma Humphreys are totally self-serving, when they are lucid. As for her poetry, it is nothing exceptional, although one piece stands out.

“Trevor was the last
And rest his soul
That people like you
Contributed to his death.”

A cynic might call this a confession.

Curiously, at page 104, she says of another Nottingham prostitute, a girl she had tried to help break away from the lifestyle:

“Inside, I realised that there was no point in me trying to help the girl if she didn’t want to help herself, so I gave up giving her the attention she was after.”

This poses two questions: did this other prostitute exist, and even if she did, was Humphreys really addressing herself?

A few comments about the video *Emma Humphreys the legacy* are in order. In this film, Humphrey looks and sounds spaced out. She also spins the feminist narrative of prostitution as not simply male exploitation of women but rape. The reality is very different of course, and certainly was for her. When she was a teenager she did not need to prostitute herself. She was still quite attractive at age thirty, so it is reasonable to assume that in her teens she was more so. *The Map Of My Life*...contains a black and white

photograph of her said to have been taken in 1983. Certainly if looks were the only criterion, most red-blooded males of about her age would not have been ashamed to take her home to meet mother.

On the strength of this photograph, had she moved back in with her father or her grandmother she could have found a more worthy suitor than Trevor Armitage, a man who would not have entertained her walking the street and would have accepted her for the flawed individual she was, as are we all.

However, if a woman has not caught her man by her late twenties, she has to lower her expectations. This is a home truth for men as well, although age is not the principal factor in their case. Instead, Humphreys was content to continue to wallow in drink and drugs selling her body to obtain the means to do so; why should any man care about a woman who behaves like that, a woman so totally lacking in self-respect? Her last love interest was a homeless man named Rico, a big come down from even Armitage, a man who had his own home whether mortgaged or rented, a car, and a reasonable income.

The most ludicrous claim made in this video though is that the *injustice* of her conviction was comparable with that of Judith Ward or even the Guildford Four.

Judith Ward was a none too bright young woman who was arrested on suspicion of a terrorist outrage that left twelve people dead. She ended up confessing to that and to a number of other bombings. She spent eighteen years in prison as a result.

The Guildford Four were cut from the same cloth. They were four social inadequates who were convicted of a bombing that left five people dead and over sixty injured. They were eventually cleared by *inter alia* alibi evidence. Only an idiot would compare these two cases with that of convicted killer Emma Humphreys.

Trevor Armitage is far from the only man Humphreys claimed raped her. She said she had been gang-raped by three deaf and dumb black men in Nottingham. (There must be a joke there somewhere about them not hearing her say no). She said she had gone with them willingly – all three of them. Does this mean she was raped or that they simply refused to pay her? She had she said warned other prostitutes about them, though not the police, although eventually the police came to her, but she refused to give a statement, though learned they had been charged with another rape. It remains to be seen if any part of this claim is true.

Bindel and Wistrich say of her aforementioned home leave visit, when she was found unconscious:

“She later disclosed that she had been picked up by a man at Kings Cross and raped”.

This underlines the importance of understanding the semantics when reading any feminist publication. Translated into English that sentence means that as an afterthought,

Humphreys claimed she had been raped, clearly realising she was jeopardising her parole prospects.

Although it is now the home of the British Library and undergoing a transformation thanks to massive redevelopment, Kings Cross was at that time a notorious red light area. What was she doing there apart from catching a train? This rape claim is pathetic. Men don't pick up prostitutes in the street, it works the other way around, and what was she doing soliciting anyway, or did she just fancy a shag, pick on the first available dude, take him down an alley for fun, and if money changed hands, use that to buy some more drugs?

After her release, she claimed to have been raped in a homeless hostel by a man who forced his way into her room. Finally, she accused her boyfriend Rico of rape shortly after her thirtieth birthday. Does anyone see a pattern here?

Now it is true that some people are more prone to assault than the rest of us. If for example a time-serving police officer told you he had been seriously assaulted six times in his career, you wouldn't be too surprised. Up until October 2015, the American Sheriff's Deputy Clay Williams had been falsely accused of rape twice and once of using excessive force – all three allegations were thwarted by body cameras. People who live in certain postcodes are more likely to be burgled than others, and quite likely you know someone who has been the victim of card fraud two or three times, indeed you may be a repeat victim yourself. But something about the claims of Emma Humphreys does not ring true. Was she really raped so many times by different men, or did she simply accuse them of rape when she tired of them, or as a pretext for murder?

The Humphreys case is one of a number that has been used by radical feminist liars on both sides of the Atlantic to put women above the law. Already in the UK, Canada and a number of other countries a man can be convicted of rape on absolutely no corroboration, solely on the word of his accuser, even if she claims he violated her years or decades ago. Now, the campaign is long underway to enable a woman to murder a man on almost any pretext and walk away Scot free or with a much reduced sentence if she can successfully plead provocation.

Provocation is something that is usually interpreted as a spur of the moment crime, but when women kill men, we are told this provocation should be extended for a period of months or even years, slow burning, because women are different. Canadian feminist academic Elizabeth Sheehy has even written a book endorsing this madness. The great irony is that feminists would have us believe that in all other respects gender is a social construct, and that a woman is not simply the equal of a man but the same creature in a different body. Unless she murders one, of course.

If the reader thinks this view is too harsh, ask yourself what would have been the result if the genders had been reversed in this case, if instead a teenage Edward Humphreys had murdered Tina Armitage, a woman twice his age. What would have been the prosecution case? It would have gone something like this:

Members of the jury, the case you are about to hear is as callous a murder as you *could* hear. Although he was only seventeen years old when he murdered Tina Armitage, Edward Humphreys had already shown himself to be a social inadequate, a hardened criminal, and indeed a sexual predator. He came from a good home, the middle of three siblings, but was constantly in trouble. When his father asked him if he would like to come and live with him instead of his mother and stepfather, he agreed, but shortly he moved out of his father's house to live with his grandmother. After tiring with that arrangement, he left home on his own and preyed on older, lonely women offering them sex for money in order to buy drink and drugs until one day he met a woman who had a son of about his age. He moved in with her but was never satisfied, and continued selling sex being arrested for two assaults, and when Tina Armitage had had enough of him, he smashed her windows and damaged her clothes. He was arrested for this, but after spending a short time in custody, Mrs Armitage took him back. He repaid that kindness by stabbing her through the heart, ostensibly because she laughed at him, nothing more terrible than that.

Edward Humphreys had been in the habit of cutting himself since the age of seven. I submit members of the jury, this proves that in spite of his youth he is a dangerous individual who should be locked up to protect both the public and himself. Now I will call my first witness.

Would that not be a fair summation of such a case, and indeed is that not a fair summation of the case of Saint Emma, the mentally disturbed, toxic, dangerous young woman the misnamed Justice For Women organisation tells us left an inspiring legacy?

Sadly, the Emma Humphreys case is far from unique, as you will know already if you have followed the links to the Justice For Women website. The case of teen murderess Stacey Hyde is remarkably similar to that of Humphreys, although she had even less justification because not only did she stab her victim in the back, but there was never even the suggestion he had used violence on her. The Court Of Appeal took a similar approach to her case, and she is now free to murder some other hapless man. Justice For Women had less success with murderess and false rape accuser Jane Andrews, although she has now been paroled. You can read a bit about both these cases here.

The case of kept woman Zoora Shah was championed by Southall Black Sisters. Like Justice For Women they concocted an entirely false narrative to exculpate this guilty murderess. Thankfully her appeal was heard by Lord Justice Kennedy who eviscerated her spurious claims, claims that had not been made at her trial for the same reason the Humphreys provocation claims were not heard at hers: they were not concocted until much later.

The key rule to remember in all such cases is this: when a woman is cross-examined in a rape trial and it is suggested she might not be telling the Gospel truth, this is known as blaming the victim, but when a man is murdered by a woman, and she justifies his death

with a cock and bull story about rape or some other kind of abuse, then blaming the victim is okay, because he is in no position to defend himself.

Hopefully this long overdue exposition of the true facts of the Emma Humphreys case will help reverse this absurd trend in the perversion of the rule of law, so that like men, women are held accountable for their gratuitous bad acts.